



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/060,551	01/30/2002	Shie-Ming Hwang	1224-005	2024	
75	90 08/13/2004		EXAM	INER	
Donald O. Nickey			AFREMOVA, VERA		
8765 Colvin Dr Plain City, OH	- · · ·		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•			1651		
			DATE MAILED: 08/13/200	4	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/060,551	HWANG, SHIE-MIN	G
Examiner	Art Unit	
Vera Afremova	1651	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 14 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

	PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) 🔲	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
b) 🗌	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	In
e have	ensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension and the corresponding amount of the fee.	n

tee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the lee. The appropriate extension				
fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or				
(2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if				
timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in				
··· ·· ·· ·· ·· ·· ·· ·· ·· ·· ·· ·· ··				

1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a) ☑ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☑ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
(c) Ithey are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
A Nowly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment

ں.∪	Applicant's reply has overcome the following	g rejection(s)
4.□	Newly proposed or amended claim(s)	would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment
	canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	
- 🖂	T 1 (C) (C) (1) 1 (C) (1) (C) (C)	and for an analytic state that have been as a state and had done NOT about the

5.⊠	The a)∐ affidavit, b)∐ exhibit, or c)⊠ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the
	application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
_	

3.	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly
	raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7.	For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an
	explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u>. Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u>. Claim(s) rejected: <u>8-15</u>.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

8.	The drawing correction filed on	is a)□	approved or b	b)	disapproved by the Examiner
----	---------------------------------	--------	---------------	----	-----------------------------

9.	Note the attached Information Disclosure Stat	ement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)
10.	Other:	

VERA AFREMOVA PH.D. PATENT EXAMINER Continuation of 2. NOTE: New issues that requires further consideration and/or search are newly introduced limitations such as "consisting essentially of" (claim 8), "boiling" aqueous extract (claim 8) and the use of additional characteristics of the extract(s) encompassed by the newly introduced phrase "additionally" (claim 9). The issues of new matter might also exist. .

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With regard to claim objections, the correction of typing errors is acknowledged.

As related to the claim rejection under 102, the applicants' arguments are mostly drawn to the newly introduced limitation(s), and, thus, they require further consideration and/or search. With respect to the claim 9 it is noted that they use of component(s) of "three isolated peaks presently claimed" (also argued on the response page 5) is solely related to the extract of Pogostemon cablin (specification 10, lines 17-21 wherein P10E is the Pogostemon cablin extract, see page 14, line 12 and 1). Therefore, these arguments cannot be fully considered as related to the use of extract derived from Agastashe rugosa.

V. Spren